

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 8, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 8, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9, 14-20, 22-24, 27 and 30-34 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 14-20, 22-23 and 32-34 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 9, 17, 32 and 34 have been amended. Claims 24, 27 and 30-31 have been cancelled.

Interview Summary

On April 2, 2008, a telephonic interview was held between Joseph Jong, attorney, Sarah Koniewicz, the assistant Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner. The parties discussed the cited references including *Rubin*. Claims 9, 17 and 24 were discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to claim 9. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

During the interview, Applicants argued that *Rubin* does not teach the claim elements. No agreement could be reached at the time of the interview, but the Examiners agreed that the proposed amendments discussed would clarify the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9, 14-20, 22-24, 27, 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 24 and 27 have been cancelled, obviating the rejection. Claims 9, 17, 32 and 34 have been amended to make the claims definite, therefore withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9, 14-20, 22-24, 27, 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by (*Rubin et al.* (US 2002/0099552).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Rubin* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". For example, *Rubin* does not disclose "analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data." The Examiner argues that *Rubin* discloses this claim element at paragraph 87, lines 6-17 and paragraph 88, lines 1-10. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to a user selecting the position or anchor of an audio annotation. The Examiner maintains that the document being annotated in *Rubin* has a first "view" when the first user is creating an audio annotation, and has a second "view" whenever the document is later opened. However, the Examiner is reading the word "view" in the claims too broadly. "View" is defined in the specification at paragraph 20 as generally referring to any visible (or virtual) collection of data containing a set of visible sub-objects, regardless of the underlying data type." The claims have been amended to make this meaning explicit. Once the term "view" is properly construed in the context of the present claims, it is clear that *Rubin* neither teaches a first view nor a second view of data.

Furthermore, *Rubin* does not analyze a plurality of views of data. Further, *Rubin* does not teach “analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data.”

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)